

## **REMARKS**

Claims 3-13, 16-21, 24, 26-35, 37, 39 and 41-67 were pending and presented for examination and in this application. In a Final Office Action dated September 11, 2007, claims 3-13, 16-21, 24, 26-35, 37, 39 and 41-67 were rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

### **Amendments to the Specification**

Applicants are deleting paragraphs [0001]-[0003] and amending paragraphs [0004], of the Specification, and submitting the Supplemental Application Data Sheet filed herewith to delete the claims of priority to U.S. Patent Application Nos. 10/404,916, 10/404,927, 10/639,282 and 10/665,097. Following entry of this amendment, this application will contain no claims of priority to the aforementioned U.S. Patent Applications.

Applicants are also amending paragraphs [0016], [0105], [0152], [0158] and [0163] to correct unintentional typographical errors and to insert application numbers and filing dates not previously added in the Specification.

### **Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) In View of Dozier and Bell**

In the 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph of the Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 3-7, 11-12, and 16-17 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,870,552 ("Dozier") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0130952 ("Bell"). This rejection is now traversed.

Independent claim 3, as amended, recites:

A method of composing a collection of information comprising:  
receiving a plurality of paper documents in an order;  
*determining the order of the plurality of paper documents;*  
responsive to the order of the plurality of paper documents, selecting at  
least one action from a group of actions consisting of:  
creating a new collection;  
modifying a collection; and  
adding an electronic representation of a document to a  
collection; and  
performing the selected at least one action *based on the order of  
the plurality of paper documents.* (Emphasis added).

Claim 4 has been similarly amended to recite elements similar to those above for  
Claim 1.

The claimed invention pertain to a method of composing a collection of information  
that comprises: receiving a plurality of paper documents **in an order, determining the  
order**, selecting at least one action **responsive to the order**, and performing the selected  
action **based on the determined order**. The claimed invention thus provides a mechanism  
by which a user can specify what action should be taken on a document collection simply  
through providing a stack of paper documents in a particular order, and doing nothing more.  
The action is performed based on the received order of the documents. An advantage of the  
claimed method is that it avoids any need for user interaction with an electronic user  
interface in order to select/perform an action.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by the cited  
references considered alone or in the combination proposed by the Examiner. Specifically,  
Dozier, as presently understood, merely describes actions being taken on electronic  
documents based on user commands provided via an electronic user interface. It does not  
disclose or suggest selecting/performing an action on documents based on the order in which  
they are received. Applicants do not dispute the fact that Dozier may order its electronic

documents; however all actions taken on documents are based on user commands input and specified by the user via the user interface. There is no teaching or suggestion in Dozier of performing an action on the documents in response to such an order as claimed herein.

Bell does not remedy Dozier's deficiencies. Bell merely describes a method of scanning a paper document along with a separate paper that contains the usage permissions of the document, and storing the content of the document and the content of the permissions information into a merchandise database and a rights database, respectively. Although it is preferred that the paper that contains the usage permissions is placed as a cover sheet and submitted to the scanner before the document itself, reversing the order in which the permissions sheet and document are scanned does not alter the subsequent actions to be taken. In other words, regardless of the order in which paper document and permissions are scanned, the method always stores the corresponding content into the designated database. This is not the same as receiving paper documents in an order and selecting/performing an action on the documents responsive to the order of the documents as claimed herein.

Thus, the deficient disclosures of Dozier and Bell, considered either alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, fail to establish even an *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) can be made. As discussed above, the references do not teach, suggest or disclose all of the claimed limitations of claims 3 and 4. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 3 and 4 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 5-7, 11, 12, 16 and 17 variously depend from claims 3 and 4, which are shown above to be patentable over the cited references and which recite additional features not

shown in the cited references. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 5-7, 11, 12, 16 and 17 also are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

**Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Chen and Bell**

In the 7<sup>th</sup> paragraph of the Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 18-22 and 24-27 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,009,442 (“Chen”) in view of Bell. This rejection is now traversed.

Independent claim 18, as amended, recites:

A method for adding an annotation to an electronically stored collection of information, comprising:  
receiving a media item comprising a piece of paper having a collection identifier, the collection identifier identifying the electronically stored collection of information, and the media item also comprising the annotation;  
reading the collection identifier and the annotation from the media item;  
*accessing the electronically stored collection of information identified by the collection identifier; and*  
adding an electronic representation of the annotation to the electronically stored collection of information. (Emphasis added).

The claimed invention pertains to receiving a media item, reading an annotation and a collection identifier from the media item, accessing the electronically stored collection of information identified by the collection identifier, and *adding an electronic representation of the annotation to an electronically stored collection identified by the collection identifier by first *accessing the electronically stored collection of information identified by the collection identifier**. It is emphasized that the annotation is read from a media item, and an electronic representation of the annotation is added to an electronic collection identified by a collection identifier on the paper media item.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by Chen and Bell considered alone or in the combination proposed by the Examiner. Chen, as presently understood, describes, in very general terms, that an annotations utility “provides the user with the option of adding annotations to a document before a scanning operation is completed” (col. 18, lines 44-46). The annotation is read from a paper, but it is *added to a paper document*. Chen does not disclose or suggest adding an annotation to an *electronic* collection, nor does it disclose or suggest reading a collection identifier from non-electronic media item. Bell does not remedy these deficiencies. Bell merely shows a method of encoding an accompanying document’s permissions right on a cover sheet when scanning a document into electronic format. This is not the same as creating and adding an electronic representation of the annotation and adding it to the collection. In summary, the deficient disclosures of Chen and Bell, considered either alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, fail to teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 18 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 19-21 and 24-27 variously depend from claim 18, which is shown above to be patentable over the cited references and which recites additional features not shown in the cited references. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 19-21 and 24-27 also are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

#### **Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) In View of Dozier**

In the 9<sup>th</sup> paragraph of the Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 8-10 and 13 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Dozier. This rejection is now traversed.

Claim 10 was canceled in a previously-submitted Response. Claims 8, 9 and 13 depend from claim 4 and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 4. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, claims 8, 9 and 13 are hereby submitted to be patentable over Dozier.

**Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) In View of Chen**

Examiner rejects claims 28-32 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chen. This rejection is now traversed.

Claims 28-32 depend from claim 18 and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 18. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, claims 28-32 are hereby submitted to be patentable over Chen.

Claims 28-32 further recite additional limitations concerning reading the annotation from the media item. For example, claim 28 recites scanning an annotation region, while claim 29 recites performing optical character recognition. Such limitations are not found in Chen.

**Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)**  
**In View of Dozier and MacPhail and Bergen**

In the 10<sup>th</sup> paragraph of the Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 33-37, 39 and 41-67 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Dozier in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,280,609 (“MacPhail”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,710,874 (“Bergen”). This rejection is now traversed.

Independent claim 33, as amended, recites:

A method of providing differentiated access to a collection of information, the method comprising:

generating a first pointer to a collection of information, the first pointer further specifying a first access level from a plurality of access levels, *wherein the first access level identifies a first level of access privileges*;  
generating a second pointer to the collection, the second pointer specifying a second access level different from the first access level, *wherein the second access level identifies a second level of access privileges*;  
generating a machine-readable indicium representing at least one of the first pointer and the second pointer; and  
outputting a document including the machine-readable indicium. (Emphasis added).

Claim 33 recites a method providing a mechanism for enabling a first access level for users having a first machine-readable indicium and a second, access level for users having a second machine-readable indicium. The first access level identifies a first level of privileges and the second access level identifies a second level of privileges. Thus, a first user might be able to read but not edit a collection, while a second user can read and/or edit the collection. The invention enables such a scheme by providing each of the two users with a different document having a machine-readable indicium such as a bar code. Each bar code allows access to the same collection, but the two bar codes allow different levels of access to the collection.

None of the cited references teaches or suggests such a scheme. Dozier fails to teach any method by which two different access levels to the same collection are enabled by two different pointers. Rather, Dozier merely describes document authoring, content-based indexing and retrieval of documents, management and publishing of document collections, and support for database operations. In the Examiner's previous Office Action, the Examiner stated on page 22 that Dozier teaches a method of providing differentiated access to a collection of information, but the Examiner did not indicate where in Dozier such a teaching can be found. In the present Office Action (on page 22 and page 48), the Examiner recited

the same remarks, but again failed to indicate where such a teaching can be found in Dozier. Applicants have reviewed Dozier and have not been able to locate any such teaching therein. In fact, no mention of “access level” or “differentiated” appears anywhere in the description provided by Dozier. At col. 8, lines 35-38, Dozier states that “tools menu 106 performs administrative tasks, such as setting access controls (i.e., costs and security privileges), for collections as a group,” but does not mention any technique for setting such controls in a manner that permits different access levels for different users, where the different access levels identify different access privileges. Further, Dozier does not teach or disclose outputting documents with machine-readable indicium that represent pointers specifying the different access levels as claimed herein.

MacPhail also fails to provide any teaching or suggestion of the claim limitations recited herein. MacPhail merely describes methods of retrieving and maintaining a document-in-folder object from an information processing system. Document objects associated with a document is identified, and a plurality of operands is built for retrieving data objects. The Examiner states that MacPhail teaches using pointers, or “LADN entry,” to identify the security limitations. However, Applicants respectfully disagree. LADNs (document library identifiers) are unique names for documents (col. 4, lines 12-14). They are used in document relation object to describe the logical relationships among documents (col. 4, lines 31-39). Nowhere in MacPhail is it described or suggested that LADNs are pointers to a security level associated with a document. Rather, MacPhail describes that a document model object controls the access to a document (col. 4, line 20-23), but it does not teach or suggest using LADNs in document model object in relation to security level of a document. Further, nowhere in MacPhail is there any mention of providing two (or more) pointers to a



collection, each pointer specifying a different access level to the same collection; furthermore, there is no mention in MacPhail of generating a machine-readable indicium and outputting a document including the machine-readable indicium, as claimed herein.

Bergen does not remedy the deficiencies of Dozier and MacPhail. Bergen merely describes a system for managing memory in a printing system by altering a state of a printing system subsystem via reference to a substrate including a machine readable code. The disclosure of Bergen is wholly unrelated to the subject matter of the present claims. The Examiner asserts, on p.24 of the Office Action, that Bergen teaches a security system with a pointer to the documents that may be printed out. However, the security code of Bergen is not related to a document. Rather, it is intended to provide certain users the access to features on a printing machine (col. 9, lines 50-53). Further, Bergen does not disclose any such machine-readable code for differentiated access to a collection.

Thus, the references do not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. Accordingly, claim 33 is respectfully submitted to be patentable over the cited references, taken alone or in any combination.

Claims 34-35, 37, 39 and 44-55 depend from claim 33 and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 33. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, these claims are hereby submitted to be patentable over the cited references.

Claims 41-43 and 56-63 recite limitations similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 33. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, these claims are hereby submitted to be patentable over the cited references.

As recited in claim 64, the claimed invention is a file that provides at least two sets of access rights to the same resource by including at least two resource identifier paths. By

facilitating a scheme in which a resource path indicates access rights, the claimed invention provides a distinct advantage over prior methodologies: specifically, any interaction with the resource via one of the resource identifier paths can inherently impose the appropriate access rights.

In the Remarks accompanying the two previous Amendments, Applicants noted that the Examiner did not provide any explanation for the rejection of claim 64, other than to state that claim 64 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 41. In response, the Examiner reiterated the rejection but still did not provide any indication as to where in the cited references there is any reference to the claimed subject matter. The Examiner did not provide any guidance as to where the other limitations of claim 64 can be found in the cited references.

As previously stated, none of the cited references provides any mechanism by which two resource identifier paths are used to point to the same resource but with different access rights. In the absence of any indication as to where such a notion purportedly appears in the cited art, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claim 64 and the dependent claims (65-67) that incorporate limitations there from.

Finally, Applicants also note that the Examiner has failed to address claim 68, which was added in the previous response filed by Applicants May 30, 2007.

### **Conclusion**

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3-13, 16-21, 24, 26-35, 37, 39, and 41-68, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,  
JOHN BARRUS ET AL.

Date: October 30, 2007

By: /Kanda Ishihara/  
Attorneys for Assignee  
Kanda Ishihara, Reg. No. 56,607  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7805  
Fax: (650) 938-5200